

**REMARKS**

Claims 16-26, 28, 30-41, 43, and 45-55 remain in this application. Claims 1-15, 27, 29, 42 and 44 have been canceled. Independent Claims 16, 26, and 41 have been amended and dependent Claims 17-21, 24, 28, 30-32, 34, 37, 39, 43, 45-47, 52 and 54 are currently amended.

All claims were objected to because there is no antecedent basis for the phrase “control service information”. Applicant has amended all claims as recommended by the Examiner to traverse this objection.

Claims 41, 43, and 45-55 were rejected under 35 USC 112 because of the use of “apparatus” recited in line 5 of independent Claim 41. Applicant has replaced “apparatus” with “memory” and believes this amendment traverses the 112 rejection.

Claims 26, 28, 30-31, 38-46 and 53-55 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Putzolu, in view of Handley; and Claims 1-6, 8, 10-25, 32-37, and 47-52 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Putzolu in view of Handley and Gonzalez, and Zigmond. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent Claim 16 has been amended to include the limitation of *the centralized control apparatus communicates the service control information over a single unidirectional communication path and the group of end user download devices and the multi-cast distribution network cooperable for using information learned from the service control information for connecting the group of end user download devices to the offered content without the group of end user download devices communicating to the centralized control apparatus.* Applicant believes none of the cited art teaches, discloses, or otherwise renders unpatentable the combination of limitations in the amended Claim 16

Independent Claims 26 and 41 have been amended to include similar limitations and are also believed to be allowable over the cited art for at least the above-stated reason.

All other claims depends from and further limits, in a patentable sense, either independent Claims 16, 26 and 41 and, hence, are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

**CONCLUSION**

For the above reasons, the foregoing amendment places the Application in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and full allowance granted. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, please contact Bobby Slaton at (972) 519-2295.

Respectfully submitted,

ALCATEL

Dated: May 15, 2006

/Bobby D. Slaton/

Bobby D. Slaton  
Reg. No. 43,130

Alcatel USA  
Intellectual Property Department  
3400 W. Plano Parkway, M/S LEGL2  
Plano, TX 75075  
Phone: (972) 519-2295  
Fax: (972) 477-9328